



HAL
open science

Explicit Kronecker-Weyl theorems and applications to prime number races

Alexandre Bailleul

► **To cite this version:**

Alexandre Bailleul. Explicit Kronecker-Weyl theorems and applications to prime number races. 2020.
hal-02897056v1

HAL Id: hal-02897056

<https://hal.science/hal-02897056v1>

Preprint submitted on 11 Jul 2020 (v1), last revised 29 Jun 2022 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Explicit Kronecker-Weyl theorems and applications to prime number races

Alexandre Bailleul

Abstract

We prove explicit versions of the Kronecker-Weyl theorems, both in a discrete and a continuous settings, without any linear independence hypothesis. As an application, we propose an alternative approach to problems concerning asymptotic densities in prime number races, over number fields and over function fields in one variable over finite fields, in the language of random variables. Our approach allows us to prove new results on the existence and positivity of some of those densities, which, in the case of races over function fields, do not require any linear independence hypothesis.

Introduction

The Kronecker-Weyl theorem is an important result of harmonic analysis, with links with ergodic theory, and which has been used to study many arithmetical problems of statistical nature. It is both a multidimensional generalization of Weyl's famous result on the equidistribution of the fractional parts of $n\alpha$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), when α is an irrational number, and a generalization of Kronecker's density result on the torus. More specifically, let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ be real numbers, then the one-parameter subgroup

$$\Gamma := \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 x}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n x} \right) \mid x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

is equidistributed in a subtorus inside the n -dimensional torus

$$\mathbb{T}^n := \{ (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, |z_i| = 1 \}$$

with respect to its Haar measure $d\mu$. In other words, the topological closure $\bar{\Gamma}$ of Γ in \mathbb{T}^n is a closed subgroup of \mathbb{T}^n with Haar measure $d\mu$ and for every continuous function $f : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X f \left(e^{i\theta_1 x}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n x} \right) dx \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\bar{\Gamma}} f d\mu.$$

Most relevant to the present work is the additional information that $\bar{\Gamma}$ is a m -dimensional torus, where m is the dimension of the \mathbb{Q} -vector space spanned by $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$. In particular, if $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ are \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent, then $\bar{\Gamma} = \mathbb{T}^n$, so we obtain Kronecker's density result in a strong form (in the sense that equidistribution holds), and when $n = 1$, this is exactly Weyl's equidistribution result.

There exists a discrete version of the Kronecker-Weyl Theorem, in which we consider the discretely-parametrized subgroup

$$\Gamma := \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n X} \right) \mid X \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

In this case, integrals are replaced by sums and we require the real numbers $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ to be \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent with π . The reason for this is clear, since $e^{iq\pi X}$ assumes discrete values in \mathbb{T} when X ranges over the integers, and q is a rational number. Usually, both the continuous and the discrete versions of the Kronecker-Weyl Theorem are proved using abstract harmonic analysis (see [18, Theorem 2.2.5] or [9, Theorem 4.2] for instance). In this paper, we give an elementary proof of a general version of Kronecker-Weyl's result, both in the discrete and the continuous case, in which we explicitly construct the set in which Γ equidistributes. We insist on the fact that no hypothesis of linear independence is required in our result (see Corollary 1.4, Theorem 1.9 and Corollary 1.14).

The Kronecker-Weyl theorem is at the heart of the modern approach (initiated by Rubinstein and Sarnak in [20]) to the study of so-called "prime number races", which consists in investigating the properties of the set

$$\mathcal{P}_{q;a_1,\dots,a_D} := \{x \geq 2 \mid \pi(x; q, a_1) > \pi(x; q, a_2) > \dots > \pi(x; q, a_D)\},$$

where $\pi(x; k, c)$ is the number of primes $p \leq x$ such that $p \equiv c \pmod k$. Here, the invertible classes a_1, \dots, a_D are called the *contestants* of the prime number race. Assuming the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis, Rubinstein and Sarnak proved that functions of the form

$$E_{q;a_1,\dots,a_D} : y \mapsto \left(\pi(e^y; q, a_1) - \frac{\text{Li}(e^y)}{\varphi(q)}, \dots, \pi(e^y; q, a_D) - \frac{\text{Li}(e^y)}{\varphi(q)} \right)$$

admit limiting distributions, according to the following definition.

Definition 0.1. *Let $E : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$. We say E admits a limiting distribution μ when μ is a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d such that for any bounded continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, one has*

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X f(E(y)) \, dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^D} f \, d\mu.$$

From there, and assuming the linear independence over \mathbb{Q} of the non-negative imaginary parts of non-trivial zeros of Dirichlet L -functions mod q (an hypothesis called the Grand Simplicity Hypothesis or GSH in [20]), Rubinstein and Sarnak proved that sets of the form

$$\{x \geq 2 \mid \pi(e^x; q, a_1) > \pi(e^x; q, a_2) > \dots > \pi(e^x; q, a_D)\}$$

admit natural densities strictly between 0 and 1.

The discrete version of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem has been used initially by Cha [6], followed by other authors ([8], [7], [11]), to study other kinds of prime number races over function fields, still assuming some form of linear independence between the zeros of the corresponding L -functions.

Further works aimed at weakening those linear independence hypotheses. In [16], Martin and Ng introduced the notions of *exhaustivity*, *weak inclusiveness* and *inclusiveness* of prime number races, focusing on the unboundedness (resp. the existence of the logarithmic densities, resp. the positivity of the logarithmic densities) of sets of the form $\mathcal{P}_{q;a_1,\dots,a_D}$. They introduced the notion of *self-sufficient zero* ([16, Definition 1.3]), and assuming various hypotheses on the existence of such zeros, proved the weak inclusiveness or inclusiveness of the corresponding prime number races. These assumptions were weakened by Devin in [9], who even studied the regularity of the corresponding limiting distributions in a more general setting.

Among the aforementioned properties we will mostly be interested in weak inclusiveness and inclusiveness. We recall the definition of these notions in the context of general prime number races.

Definition 0.2. Let a_1, \dots, a_D be contestants in a prime number race. We say the race between a_1, \dots, a_D is weakly inclusive if for every permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, D\}$, the set $\{X \geq 2 \mid \Pi(X, a_{\sigma(1)}) > \dots > \Pi(X, a_{\sigma(D)})\}$ admits a natural density, where the $\Pi(\cdot, a)$ are the corresponding rescaled prime counting functions. We say the prime number race is inclusive if moreover those densities are positive.

The prime number races referred to in the above definition will be of two types in the present work. First, a prime number race over a number field denotes the race between unramified prime ideals in a Galois extension L/K of number fields with given Frobenius automorphisms in $\text{Gal}(L/K)$, as was first suggested in [20, Section 5] and first studied in [17, Chapter 5]. In that case, the contestants are distinct conjugacy classes C_1, \dots, C_D of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$, and the rescaled prime counting functions are

$$\Pi(X, C_i) := \frac{\pi(e^X; L/K, C_i)}{\#C_i} = \frac{1}{\#C_i} \#\{\mathfrak{p} \text{ prime ideal of } K \text{ unramified in } L \mid N\mathfrak{p} \leq e^X, \text{Frob}_{\mathfrak{p}} = C_i\}.$$

That the variable has to be changed to e^X comes from the shape of the explicit formulas involved (see [17, Chapter 5]).

Second, a prime number race over a function field denotes the race between unramified prime divisors in a Galois extension L/K of functions fields in one variable over a finite field with given Frobenius automorphisms in $\text{Gal}(L/K)$. In that case, the contestants are distinct conjugacy classes C_1, \dots, C_D of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$, and the rescaled prime counting functions are

$$\Pi(X, C_i) := \frac{\pi(X; L/K, C_i)}{\#C_i} = \frac{1}{\#C_i} \#\{P \text{ prime divisor of } K \text{ unramified in } L \mid \deg P = X, \text{Frob}_P = C_i\}.$$

One can also consider functions counting prime divisors of K with a given Frobenius automorphism of degree less than X , instead of equal to X , as was studied in [8]. Of course we recover the classical case of Rubinstein and Sarnak for primes in arithmetic progressions [20] in the number field case by considering an appropriate cyclotomic extension of \mathbb{Q} . Similarly we recover the races between irreducible polynomials in arithmetic progressions of [6] by considering an appropriate Carlitz extension of $\mathbb{F}_q(T)$.

More general races have been studied in the literature, for instance the race between prime quadratic residues and prime non-quadratic residues modulo an integer q in [20], the race between $\pi(x)$ and $\text{Li}(x)$ in [20] and [1], the race between products of k irreducible polynomials over a finite field in [11], the race between the number of points on the reduction modulo good primes of elliptic curves in [7] and many more. In any case, it is clear to which category each of those races should belong, either over number fields or function fields. Our general results can be applied to those situations as well.

The first step in studying a prime number race over a function field is to write an explicit formula, *i.e.* express the corresponding prime counting functions as sums involving $e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r X}$, where $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ are the positive arguments (between 0 and π) of the inverse zeros of the corresponding rational L -functions. As an application of our version of the discrete Kronecker-Weyl theorem, we give sufficient conditions for the existence and for the positivity of the natural densities relevant to those kinds of races. Recently, Devin ([10]) studied the question of the existence of those densities, and provided sufficient conditions on the coefficients of the functions involved in the explicit formulas. Our approach is transverse to hers, as we give conditions on the functions themselves. Our approach is also considerably more elementary, as Devin relies on multiple tools of harmonic analysis to deduce that "ties have density zero" in such races. We avoid the use of such techniques thanks to our approach based on random variables and our key Lemma 1.8.

In the case of prime number races over number fields, the situation is technically more complicated, since explicit formulas for the (rescaled) prime counting functions involve infinite series in $e^{i\theta_1 t}, e^{i\theta_2 t}, \dots$ where $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$ are the positive imaginary parts of non-trivial zeros of the corresponding L -functions. Functions of this shape are often called almost-periodic functions. There are different classes of almost-periodic functions, depending on the way they can be approximated by trigonometric polynomials. The class which is most relevant to us is the (large) class of Besicovitch almost-periodic functions, called B^1 almost-periodic functions. The existence of the limiting distributions of such functions was shown in [1, Theorem 2.9]. See also [4, Theorem 4.1] for a similar proof in a slightly larger space than B^1 . As an application of our version of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem, we give a more precise description of this limiting distribution, under various hypotheses on the almost-periods θ_n of the B^1 almost-periodic function which is being studied (Corollary 1.21). We also give a new proof of a recent result of Devin, giving sufficient conditions for the existence of the densities associated to B^1 -almost periodic functions. Our approach is again more elementary and does not require the use of abstract harmonic analysis (see Corollary 1.26). We give an application to the existence of the densities involved in prime number races over number fields in Theorem 1.29.

The paper is organized as follows. In the first part, we prove explicit versions of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem, in three different cases (two discrete and one continuous) and derive consequences for the study of asymptotic densities of sets defined by strict inequalities between certain types of functions. The two discrete cases are the degenerate case in which each θ_i is a rational multiple of π (Proposition 1.3), and the non-degenerate case (Theorem 1.5). The continuous case is considered in Theorem 1.11. We apply those three theorems to obtain the existence of asymptotic densities for sets defined by strict inequalities between certain types of functions (Corollary 1.4, Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.14) without any linear independence hypothesis. In doing so, we prove Lemma 1.8 which allows us to bypass technical results from harmonic analysis to prove that the limiting distributions we consider do not admit atoms. We then generalize our methods in the presence of infinitely many real numbers $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$. In this context, we prove that B^1 almost-periodic functions admit limiting distributions (Theorem 1.17), and then under a weak linear independence assumption, we give a description of this limiting distribution (Theorem 1.21). We then tackle the problem of the existence of asymptotic densities for sets defined by strict inequalities between B^1 almost-periodic functions, assuming suitable hypotheses (Proposition 1.22 and Theorem 1.26). We then prove similar results for functions with an extra error term (Theorem 1.27), as those are the kind of functions appearing in explicit formulas for prime number races.

The second part of the paper is devoted to applications. First, we give criteria for the positivity of asymptotic densities of certain sets defined by strict inequalities (Propositions 2.1 and 2.2), with inclusiveness of prime number races over function fields in mind. We then apply the general results of the first section to the concrete problem of studying prime divisor races in geometric Galois extensions of function fields (in one variable) over finite fields. In particular, we are able to study an example of prime divisor race in which the usual linear independence hypothesis fails to hold. In the last section of the paper, we discuss the first two moments of the random variables involved in those kinds of races.

It seems a reference to a proof of the discrete version of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem is hard to find in a published form so we provide a proof in an appendix. We borrowed the proof to P. Humphries' Masters thesis [15]. For a proof of the general continuous version, see [9, Theorem 4.2].

Notations. Some notations are introduced at various places and then used many times throughout the text and we gather them here for reference. The element ν_θ always denotes $(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r})$. The quantities d and $h_{k,j}$ coming from linear dependence relations are introduced at the beginning of Section 1.1, Section 1.2 and Section 1.3, depending on the context. The subgroup $H_\theta \subset \mathbb{T}^r$ arising in the non-degenerate case is defined in Theorem 1.5. The random variables Z_θ are introduced, depending on the context, in Corollary 1.4 (degenerate case), Definition 1.6 (non-degenerate case) or Corollary 1.12 (continuous case).

1 Explicit Kronecker-Weyl theorems

We begin by recalling the definition of equidistribution that we are going to use throughout the text.

Definition 1.1. Let $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of elements of \mathbb{T}^r and H a closed subgroup of \mathbb{T}^r , and let μ_H be the Haar measure of H . We say $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equidistributed in H with respect to the measure μ_H if for every continuous $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} f(z_n) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_H f d\mu_H.$$

This definition is equivalent to the weak convergence of the measures $\frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} \delta_{z_n}$ to the measure μ_H , where δ_{z_n} is the Dirac measure at z_n . In what follows, we identify such a sequence with the set $Z := \{z_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. This is a slight abuse of notation since the set Z itself does not keep track of the numbering of the sequence. Note that if Z is equidistributed in H , then Z is in particular dense in H , so that $\overline{Z} = H$. The following is a weak version of the discrete Kronecker-Weyl theorem, which will be enough for our purpose of proving an explicit strong version.

Theorem 1.2. Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers such that $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r, \pi\}$ is linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . Then the set

$$\Gamma := \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r X} \right) \mid X \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

is equidistributed in \mathbb{T}^r (with respect to its Haar measure).

A proof is given in an appendix for reference. Notice the linear independence assumption with π . Actually, the full Kronecker-Weyl theorem states that, assuming no linear independence except with π , Γ is equidistributed in a subtorus of \mathbb{T}^r of dimension the dimension of the \mathbb{Q} -span of $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$. The goal of the following sections is to prove a precise version of this result (and of its continuous analog) with no assumption of linear independence (even with π) and with a description of the subset of \mathbb{T}^r in which Γ is equidistributed. We manage to do this by elementary means, whereas all the known proofs of the full Kronecker-Weyl theorem use abstract harmonic analysis (Pontryagin duality and Poisson summation formula).

1.1 The degenerate discrete case

In this section, consider real numbers $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ which are all rational multiples of π : $\theta_i = c_i \pi$ where each $c_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Let $\nu_\theta = (e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r})$. Clearly ν_θ is of finite order d in \mathbb{T}^r . Write $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$. We then have the following result.

Proposition 1.3. Let $\Gamma_\theta = \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r X} \right) \mid X \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$. Then Γ_θ is equidistributed in the cyclic subgroup $\langle \nu_\theta \rangle$ generated by ν_θ with respect to its uniform measure. In fact for any function $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} f(\nu_\theta^a).$$

Proof. Clearly we have $\Gamma_\theta = \{(1, \dots, 1), \nu_\theta, \nu_\theta^2, \dots, \nu_\theta^{d-1}\} = \langle \nu_\theta \rangle$. Let $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be any function. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) &= \frac{1}{X} \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \frac{X}{d} \rfloor} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} f(\nu_\theta^{qd+a}) + o(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{X} \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \frac{X}{d} \rfloor} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} f(\nu_\theta^a) + o(1) \\ &= \frac{\lfloor \frac{X}{d} \rfloor}{X} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} f(\nu_\theta^a) + o(1) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} f(\nu_\theta^a). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 1.4. Let $f_1, \dots, f_D : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let $F_j : t \mapsto f_j \left(e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t} \right)$ for $1 \leq j \leq D$. Then

$$\frac{1}{X} \# \{n \leq X \mid F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)\} \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(Z_\theta))$$

where Z_θ is a (discrete) uniform random variable on $\langle \nu_\theta \rangle$.

Proof. Apply Theorem 1.3 to the function $\mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D} \circ (f_1, \dots, f_D)$. □

1.2 The non-degenerate discrete case

We now consider real numbers $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$, at least one of which is not a rational multiple of π , say θ_1 . Write again $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$.

Up to reindexing, extract a basis $\{2\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$ of the \mathbb{Q} -vector space $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$. Now, we write the decomposition of $\theta_{m+1}, \dots, \theta_r$ in this basis :

$$\theta_j = 2\pi c_j + \sum_{k=1}^m b_{k,j} \theta_k \text{ for } m+1 \leq j \leq r$$

with $c_j, b_{k,j} \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Finally, we let d be the least common multiple of the denominators of each c_j and each $b_{k,j}$, so that $l_j := dc_j \in \mathbb{Z}, h_{k,j} := db_{k,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 1.5. Let $\Gamma_\theta = \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r X} \right) \mid X \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$. Then Γ_θ is equidistributed in $\overline{\Gamma_\theta} = \bigcup_{a=0}^{d-1} \nu_\theta^a H_\theta = \langle \nu_\theta \rangle H_\theta$, where $\nu_\theta = \left(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r} \right)$ and

$$H_\theta = \left\{ \left(z_1^d, \dots, z_m^d, \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,m+1}}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,r}} \right) \mid (z_1, \dots, z_m) \in \mathbb{T}^m \right\} \subset \mathbb{T}^r$$

with Haar measure μ_{H_θ} . The measure with respect to which Γ_θ is equidistributed is $\frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mu_a$, where μ_a is the pushforward of μ_{H_θ} to $\nu_\theta^a H_\theta$.

Proof. We first show that

$$\Gamma_\theta = \bigcup_{a=0}^{d-1} \nu_\theta^a \tilde{H}$$

where

$$\tilde{H} := \left\{ \left(e^{id\theta_1 q}, \dots, e^{id\theta_m q}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ih_{k,j}\theta_k q}, \dots \right) \mid q \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

To do this, we split Γ_θ according to its congruence classes modulo d :

$$\Gamma_\theta = \bigcup_{a=0}^{d-1} \Gamma_a,$$

where

$$\Gamma_a := \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r X} \right) \mid X \equiv a \pmod{d} \right\}.$$

Expressing each θ_j with $m+1 \leq j \leq r$ in the basis $\{2\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$, we find for $0 \leq a \leq d-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_a &= \left\{ \left(e^{ia\theta_1} e^{id\theta_1 q}, \dots, e^{ia\theta_m} e^{id\theta_m q}, \dots, e^{2i\pi l_j q} e^{2i\pi a c_j} \prod_{k=1}^m e^{iab_{k,j}\theta_k} \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ih_{k,j}\theta_k q}, \dots \right) \mid q \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \left(\nu_1^a e^{id\theta_1 q}, \dots, \nu_m^a e^{id\theta_m q}, \dots, \nu_j^a \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ih_{k,j}\theta_k q}, \dots \right) \mid q \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where we wrote

$$\nu_j = e^{i\theta_j} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq m$$

and

$$\nu_j = e^{2i\pi c_j} \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ib_{k,j}\theta_k} = e^{i\theta_j} \text{ for } m+1 \leq j \leq r.$$

We have thus shown that

$$\Gamma_\theta = \bigcup_{a=0}^{d-1} \nu_\theta^a \tilde{H}$$

as announced.

Let us show that this union is disjoint : let $a, b \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. If $\nu_1^a e^{id\theta_1 q} = \nu_1^b e^{id\theta_1 q'}$ then we have $\theta_1(a + qd - b - q'd) = 2k\pi$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since θ_1 is not a rational multiple of π , we find $a + qd = b + q'd$, hence $a = b$ by uniqueness of the remainder in euclidean division.

Now the discrete Kronecker-Weyl theorem 1.2 implies that $\left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_m X} \right) \mid X \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$ is equidistributed in \mathbb{T}^m . Lifting by the continuous surjective homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}^m &\longrightarrow H_\theta \\ \varphi : (z_1, \dots, z_m) &\mapsto \left(z_1^d, \dots, z_m^d, \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,m+1}}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,r}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

we find that for every continuous $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{q \leq X} f \left(e^{id\theta_1 q}, \dots, e^{id\theta_m q}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ih_{k,j}\theta_k q}, \dots \right) &= \frac{1}{X} \sum_{q \leq X} f \circ \varphi \left(e^{i\theta_1 q}, \dots, e^{i\theta_m q} \right) \\ &\xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} f \circ \varphi \, d\mu \\ &= \int_{H_\theta} f \, d(\varphi_* \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_*\lambda$ is the pushforward measure of the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^m by φ . This measure is readily verified to be the Haar measure μ_{H_θ} on H_θ , since it has mass one and it is invariant by translations.

We have thus shown that for every continuous $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{q=1}^X f \left(e^{id\theta_1 q}, \dots, e^{id\theta_m q}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ih_{k,j}\theta_k q}, \dots \right) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{H_\theta} f d\mu_{H_\theta},$$

i.e. that \tilde{H} is equidistributed in H_θ with respect to its Haar measure. If we take any such f and sum it over Γ_θ instead, we now find, using the previous disjoint decomposition of Γ_θ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) &= \frac{1}{X} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \frac{X}{d} \rfloor} f \left(\nu_1^a e^{id\theta_1 q}, \dots, \nu_m^a e^{id\theta_m q}, \dots, \nu_j^a \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ih_{k,j}\theta_k q}, \dots \right) + o(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \frac{1}{\lfloor \frac{X}{d} \rfloor} \sum_{q=1}^{\lfloor \frac{X}{d} \rfloor} f_a \left(e^{id\theta_1 q}, \dots, e^{id\theta_m q}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m e^{ih_{k,j}\theta_k q}, \dots \right) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

where $f_a : z \mapsto f(\nu_\theta^a z)$ for $0 \leq a \leq d-1$. We finally obtain

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \int_{H_\theta} f_a d\mu_{H_\theta} = \int_{\Gamma_\theta} f d\nu_\theta.$$

□

Remark.

- i) The element ν_θ of the above theorem is not of finite order in \mathbb{T}^r , since $\nu_1 = e^{i\theta_1}$ has infinite order in \mathbb{T} , but it has finite order dividing d in \mathbb{T}^r/H_θ . Therefore the product of the two subgroups $\langle \nu_\theta \rangle$ and H_θ is indeed $\bigcup_{a=0}^{d-1} \nu_\theta^a H_\theta$.
- ii) The subgroup H_θ is a subtorus of \mathbb{T}^r of dimension m , and the conclusion of the above theorem is that Γ_θ is equidistributed in the union of d translates of this subtorus. Note that this union is not necessarily disjoint, as it would imply $\overline{\Gamma_\theta}$ has exactly d connected components, but the number d can be modified by choosing a different basis of $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$ without changing Γ_θ .
- iii) If $\{\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r\}$ is \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent, then we have $m = r, d = 1$ and $\overline{\Gamma_\theta} = \mathbb{T}^r$ as in Theorem 1.2.

Definition 1.6. *The random vector associated with $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ is the \mathbb{T}^r -valued random vector*

$$Z_\theta := \left(Z_1^d, \dots, Z_m^d, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m Z_k^{h_{k,j}}, \dots \right)$$

where m, d and $h_{k,j}$ are defined at the beginning of Section 1.2, and where Z_1, \dots, Z_m are independent uniform random variables on \mathbb{T} . We also note $\nu_\theta = (e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r})$.

Corollary 1.7. *For any continuous $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{E} (f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)).$$

Proof. This is just a reformulation of Theorem 1.5, where we observe that the distribution of the random vector $\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta$ is simply the measure μ_a . \square

In the context of prime number races over function fields, one approaches prime counting functions by functions of the form $t \mapsto c + \sum_{j=1}^r a_j e^{i\theta_j t} + \bar{a}_j e^{-i\theta_j t}$, with real c and complex a_j . Note that those are in particular polynomials in $e^{i\theta_1 t}, e^{-i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t}, e^{-i\theta_r t}$, i.e. Laurent polynomials in $e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_1 r}$, for which we prove the following key elementary lemma.

Lemma 1.8. *Let $f \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ with no pole in \mathbb{T}^r . Then for $0 \leq a \leq d-1$, one has $\mathbb{P}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = 0) = 0$ if and only if there exists $n \equiv a \pmod{d}$ such that $f(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n}) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Recall that $\Gamma_a = \left\{ (e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r X}) \mid X \equiv a \pmod{d} \right\}$ is equidistributed in $\nu_\theta^a H_\theta$ and that the distribution of Z_θ is precisely the Haar measure on H_θ . Therefore, if $f(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n}) = 0$ for all $n \equiv a \pmod{d}$, then by continuity of f and density of Γ_a in $\nu_\theta^a H_\theta$, we have $\mathbb{P}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = 0) = 1$.

We prove the converse statement by induction on m . If $m = 1$, then the equation

$$f\left(\nu_{\theta,1}^a z^d, \nu_{\theta,2}^a z^{h_{1,2}}, \dots, \nu_{\theta,r}^a z^{h_{1,r}}\right) = 0$$

reduces, by clearing denominators, to a polynomial equation $P(z) = 0$ with one unknown. This equation is non-trivial because, writing $n = qd + a$ with $q \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f\left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n}\right) &= f\left(e^{ia\theta_1} e^{iq\theta_1 d}, e^{i(qd+a)(2\pi c_2 + b_{1,2}\theta_1)}, \dots, e^{i(qd+a)(2\pi c_r + b_{1,r}\theta_1)}\right) \\ &= f\left(\nu_{\theta,1}^a e^{iq\theta_1 d}, \nu_{\theta,2}^a e^{iq\theta_1 h_{1,2}}, \dots, \nu_{\theta,r}^a e^{iq\theta_1 h_{1,r}}\right) \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by hypothesis, so that $P(e^{iq\theta_1}) \neq 0$. Therefore, this equation has a finite number of solutions in \mathbb{C} , and in particular in \mathbb{T} . Since Z_1 is uniform on the circle, we certainly have

$$\mathbb{P}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = 0) = \mathbb{P}\left(f\left(\nu_{\theta,1}^a Z_1^d, \nu_{\theta,2}^a Z_1^{h_{1,2}}, \dots, \nu_{\theta,r}^a Z_1^{h_{1,r}}\right) = 0\right) = 0.$$

Now assume the result is true for $m-1 \in \mathbb{N}$. As before, by clearing denominators, the equation

$$f\left(\nu_{\theta,1}^a z_1^d, \dots, z_m^d, \dots, \nu_{\theta,j}^a \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,j}}, \dots\right) = 0$$

is equivalent to a non-zero polynomial equation $P(z_1, \dots, z_m) = 0$ with m unknowns. Moreover, the set F of all $z_m \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $P(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}, z_m) = 0$ is finite, since it is the zero set of the $P(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}, Y) \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}][Y]$, which is non-zero because as above we have $P(e^{iq\theta_1}, \dots, e^{iq\theta_m}) \neq 0$ by hypothesis on $n = qd + a$. By the Fubini-Tonelli theorem, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = 0) &= \mathbb{P}\left(f\left(\nu_{\theta,1}^a Z_1^d, \dots, \nu_{\theta,m}^a Z_m^d, \dots, \nu_{\theta,j}^a \prod_{k=1}^m Z_k^{h_{k,j}}, \dots\right) = 0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(P(Z_1, \dots, Z_m) = 0) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} \mathbf{1}_{P^{-1}(\{0\})}(z) \, dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus F} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{m-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P(\cdot, z_m)^{-1}(\{0\})}(z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}) \, dz_1 \dots dz_{m-1} \right) \, dz_m \end{aligned}$$

The inner integral is zero by the induction hypothesis, so we conclude that $\mathbb{P}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = 0) = 0$. \square

We can now prove the following theorem which allows us to pass from continuous functions to indicator functions of subsets of \mathbb{R}^D defined by strict inequalities between functions as in Lemma 1.8.

Theorem 1.9. *For $1 \leq j \leq D$, let $f_j \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ be real-valued and without pole on \mathbb{T}^r and let $F_j : t \mapsto f_j(e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t})$. Then we have*

$$\frac{1}{X} \# \{n \leq X \mid F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)\} \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)).$$

Proof. We first remark that, by Lemma 1.8 and its proof, if for some $0 \leq a \leq d-1$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq D-1$ such that $f_j(e^{in\theta_1}, \dots, e^{in\theta_r}) = f_{j+1}(e^{in\theta_1}, \dots, e^{in\theta_r})$ for every $n \equiv a \pmod{d}$, then $\mathbb{P}(f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = f_{j+1}(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = 1$, so that $\mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = 0$, while we have $\lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \# \{n \leq X \mid n \equiv a \pmod{d}, F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)\} = 0$. Therefore, writing

$$\frac{1}{X} \# \{n \leq X \mid F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)\} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \frac{1}{X} \# \{n \leq X \mid n \equiv a \pmod{d}, F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)\} + o(1),$$

and using the decomposition $\Gamma = \bigcup_{a=0}^{d-1} \nu_\theta^a \tilde{H}$ as in the proof of Theorem 1.5, we may assume that for every $0 \leq a \leq d-1, 1 \leq j \leq D-1$, there exists $n \equiv a \pmod{d}$ such that $f_j(e^{in\theta_1}, \dots, e^{in\theta_r}) \neq f_{j+1}(e^{in\theta_1}, \dots, e^{in\theta_r})$. By Lemma 1.8 we then have $\mathbb{P}(f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = f_{j+1}(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = 0$ for every such a and j .

Now, we need to approximate the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D}$ by continuous functions from above and below. We proceed in the following way : for every integer $k \geq 1$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$g_k(x, y) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq y - \frac{1}{k} \\ k(x - y) + 1 & \text{if } y - \frac{1}{k} < x \leq y \\ 1 & \text{if } x > y \end{cases}$$

Then for each integer $k \geq 1$, g_k is continuous on \mathbb{R}^2 and for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbf{1}_{x_1 > x_2}(x, y) \leq g_k(x, y) \leq \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > x_2 - \frac{1}{k}}(x, y).$$

For $k \geq 1$ let $G_k : (x_1, \dots, x_D) \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^{D-1} g_k(x_j, x_{j+1})$. Then for every $k \geq 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D}(F_1(n), \dots, F_D(n)) &= \prod_{j=1}^{D-1} \mathbf{1}_{x_j > x_{j+1}}(F_j(n), F_{j+1}(n)) \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{D-1} g_k(F_j(n), F_{j+1}(n)) \\ &= G_k(F_1(n), \dots, F_D(n)) \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{D-1} \mathbf{1}_{x_j > x_{j+1} - \frac{1}{k}}(F_j(n), F_{j+1}(n)) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > x_2 - \frac{1}{k} > \dots > x_{D-1} - \frac{D-1}{k}}(F_1(n), \dots, F_D(n)) \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Corollary 1.7, for every $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D} (F_1(n), \dots, F_D(n)) &\leq \limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X G_k(F_1(n), \dots, F_D(n)) \\
&= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{E}(G_k(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta), \dots, f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta))) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{1}_{x_1 > x_2 - \frac{1}{k} > \dots > x_D - \frac{D-1}{k}} (f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta), \dots, f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P} \left(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) - \frac{D-1}{k} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By downward continuity of \mathbb{P} , we get, by letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D} (F_1(n), \dots, F_D(n)) \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P} (f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) \geq \dots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)).$$

Similarly, by considering the functions defined by

$$(x, y) \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x < y \\ k(x - y) & \text{if } y \leq x < y + \frac{1}{k}, \\ 1 & \text{if } x > y + \frac{1}{k} \end{cases},$$

we find

$$\liminf_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D} (F_1(n), \dots, F_D(n)) \geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P} (f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)).$$

It remains to observe that the event

$$\{f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) \geq \dots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)\} \setminus \{f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)\}$$

is included in

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{D-1} \{f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = f_{j+1}(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)\}$$

which has probability zero, so that

$$\mathbb{P} (f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) \geq \dots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = \mathbb{P} (f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)).$$

□

Proposition 1.4 and Theorem 1.9 yield the following general result.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers. For any $f_1, \dots, f_D \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ real-valued and without pole on \mathbb{T}^r ,*

$$\lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \# \{n \leq X \mid F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)\}$$

exists.

We note that this does not prove that every prime number race over a function field is weakly inclusive (as defined in Definition 0.2) because the normalized prime counting functions in this context have an extra $o(1)$ term (see Section 2.2). We will deal with such functions in Section 1.5.

1.3 The continuous case

We now tackle the continuous case of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem.

Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers. Extract a basis $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$ of $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$, and write

$$\theta_j = \sum_{k=1}^m b_{k,j} \theta_k \text{ for } m+1 \leq j \leq r$$

with $b_{k,j} \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let d be the least common multiple of the denominators of each $b_{k,j}$ so that $h_{k,j} := db_{k,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The proof of the following theorem is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.5. We simply mention the necessary changes : discrete sums up to X are replaced by integrals between 0 and X , the splitting according to congruence classes modulo d is replaced by the change of variable $y \rightarrow dy$ and we appeal to the continuous version of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem (see [9, Theorem 4.2] or the remark at the end of the appendix). We note that most results in this section are made easier than in the previous section because linear dependence with π doesn't have any effect on the continuous densities being studied.

Theorem 1.11. *The one-parameter subgroup*

$$\Gamma_{\theta} = \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 y}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r y} \right) \mid y \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

is equidistributed in

$$H_{\theta} = \left\{ \left(z_1^d, \dots, z_m^d, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,j}}, \dots \right) \mid (z_1, \dots, z_m) \in \mathbb{T}^m \right\},$$

that is for every continuous $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ one has

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X f \left(e^{i\theta_1 y}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r y} \right) dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{H_{\theta}} f d\mu_{H_{\theta}}$$

where $\mu_{H_{\theta}}$ is the normalized Haar measure on H_{θ} .

Interpreting the Haar measure $\mu_{H_{\theta}}$ as the distribution of a random vector Z_{θ} defined as in Definition 1.6 we obtain the following.

Corollary 1.12. *For any continuous $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X f \left(e^{i\theta_1 y}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r y} \right) dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(f(Z_{\theta}))$$

where Z_{θ} is defined as in Definition 1.6.

Note that the analog of Lemma 1.8 holds with the only hypothesis that $f \left(e^{i\theta_1 y}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r y} \right) \neq 0$ for at least one $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 1.13. *Let $f \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ with no pole in \mathbb{T}^r . Then one has $\mathbb{P}(f(Z_{\theta}) = 0) = 0$ if and only if there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f \left(e^{i\theta_1 y}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r y} \right) \neq 0$.*

The proof of the continuous analog of Theorem 1.9 then goes similarly.

Theorem 1.14. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_D \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ be real-valued and without poles on \mathbb{T}^r and let $F_j : t \mapsto f_j \left(e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t} \right)$. Then we have*

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D} (F_1(y), \dots, F_D(y)) dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_{\theta}) > \dots > f_D(Z_{\theta})).$$

1.4 An infinite-dimensional version

The goal of this section is to prove a result analogous to Theorem 1.14 but with converging series in an infinite number of $e^{i\theta_n t}$, as a natural generalization of the above Laurent polynomials. This is the kind of functions we have to deal with in the context of prime number races over number fields, because the associated L -functions have an infinite number of non-trivial zeros. Those functions are often called *almost-periodic functions*.

Definition 1.15. *The B^1 semi-norm of a locally integrable function f is*

$$\|f\|_{B^1} := \limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X |f(y)| \, dy.$$

A function $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be B^1 almost-periodic if there exists a sequence $(P_N)_{N \geq 1}$ of trigonometric polynomials of the form

$$P_N : t \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^{D_N} r_{n,N} e^{i\lambda_{n,N} t}$$

for some integer $D_N \geq 1$, $r_{n,N} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda_{n,N} \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\|F - P_N\|_{B^1} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

It turns out that prime counting functions over number fields are B^2 -almost periodic, after applying the change of variable $x \rightarrow e^x$ (see [17, Lemma 5.1.3] or [9, Proposition 4.4] for a general statement), where B^2 semi-norm is defined by $\|f\|_{B^2} = (\|f^2\|_{B^1})^{1/2}$. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality easily implies that such functions are in particular B^1 -almost periodic.

We simply quote the following important fact about B^1 almost-periodic functions ([2, p.104]).

Proposition 1.16. *Let $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be B^1 almost-periodic. There exists a countable set $\Lambda(F) = \{\lambda_n \mid n \geq 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ called the support of F , such that for every $n \geq 1$,*

$$a_n := \lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X f(y) e^{-i\lambda_n y} \, dy \neq 0.$$

Moreover we have $\|F - P_N\|_{B^1} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0$, where $P_N(F) : t \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^N a_n e^{-i\lambda_n t} + \overline{a_n} e^{-i\lambda_n t}$.

The upshot of the above Proposition is that there exists a canonical way to approximate a given B^1 almost-periodic function by trigonometric polynomials with respect to the B^1 semi-norm.

We begin by proving that B^1 -almost periodic functions admit limiting distributions. The argument is essentially the one given in the proof of [1, Theorem 2.9]. We note that the left-hand side of formula (2.10) in *loc. cit.* should be replaced by $\limsup_{Y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{Y} \int_0^Y |\phi(y) - P_N(y)| \, dy$, and that Y should be assumed large enough in the last inequality in the proof of [1, Theorem 2.9].

Theorem 1.17. *Let $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a B^1 almost-periodic function. There exists a random variable S such that for any continuous bounded function g on \mathbb{R} we have*

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) \, dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(g(S)).$$

In other words, F admits \mathbb{P}_S , the distribution of S , as a limiting distribution.

Proof. The goal is to apply Corollary 1.12 to each $P_N(F)$ before passing to the limit in N . Let g be a bounded Lipschitz function on \mathbb{R} , with Lipschitz constant c_g . Then for any $N \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) \, dy = \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(P_N(y)) \, dy + \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X (g(F(y)) - g(P_N(y))) \, dy.$$

By the triangular inequality one has

$$\left| \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X (g(F(y)) - g(P_N(y))) \, dy \right| \leq \frac{c_g}{X} \int_0^X |F(y) - P_N(y)| \, dy$$

so that $\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X (g(F(y)) - g(P_N(y))) \, dy \right| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0$. On the other hand, Corollary 1.12 yields

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(P_N(y)) \, dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(g(S_N))$$

for some random variable S_N built from the linear relations over \mathbb{Q} between the real numbers $\lambda_{1,N}, \dots, \lambda_{D_N,N}$.

This proves that

$$\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) \, dy = \mathbb{E}(g(S_N)) + o(1)$$

as N tends to infinity, and similarly we have

$$\liminf_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) \, dy = \mathbb{E}(g(S_N)) + o(1)$$

as N tends to infinity. Therefore

$$\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) \, dy - \liminf_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) \, dy = 0$$

since it is independent of N and $o(1)$ with respect to N . We have thus shown that $\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) \, dy$ admits a limit as X tends to infinity, and $\mathbb{E}(g(S_N))$ converges to this (same) limit as N tends to infinity.

We now prove that the sequence $(S_N)_{N \geq 1}$ converges in distribution to some random variable Z . To do so, we apply Prohorov's theorem [3, Theorem 5.1] (or Helly's selection theorem as it is called in [1, Lemma 2.8]), which in particular states that a tight sequence of probability measures on \mathbb{R} admits a weakly converging subsequence. Recall that a family $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of probability measures on \mathbb{R} is tight when there is no "escape of mass to infinity" along the family, *i.e.* for every $\varepsilon > 0$, one can find a compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu_n(K) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for every $n \geq 1$. Assuming that $(\mathbb{P}_{S_N})_{N \geq 1}$ is tight, and denoting by μ the weak limit of one of its subsequence, $(\mathbb{E}(g(S_N)))_{N \geq 1}$ can only converge to $\int_{\mathbb{R}} g \, d\mu$ when g is a bounded continuous function on \mathbb{R} . Since this holds for every bounded Lipschitz function on \mathbb{R} by the above computations, the Portmanteau theorem [3, Theorem 2.1] implies that $(\mathbb{P}_{S_N})_{n \geq 1}$ converges weakly to μ . Finally, the limit probability measure μ is the distribution of $S := F^{-1}(U)$, where F is the distribution function of μ , F^{-1} its generalized inverse and U is uniform on $[0, 1]$ (see [12, Theorem 2.1]), so that $(S_N)_{N \geq 1}$ converges in distribution to S .

It only remains to prove that $(\mathbb{P}_{S_N})_{N \geq 1}$ is tight. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $A > 0$. As a straightforward application of Theorem 1.14, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_N| > A) = \lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x > A}(|P_N(y)|) \, dy.$$

By Markov's inequality, we have for every $N \geq 1$ and $X > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x>A}(|P_N(y)|) dy \leq \frac{1}{AX} \int_0^X |P_N(y)| dy.$$

For every $N \geq 1$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$, one has $|P_N(y)| \leq |F(y)| + |F(y) - P_N(y)|$. Now $L := \limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X |F(y)| dy < +\infty$ since $\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X |F(y) - P_n(y)| dy < +\infty$ for at least one n , and $\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X |P_n(y)| dy < +\infty$ by Corollary 1.12. Finally we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_N| > A) \leq \frac{1}{A} \limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X |F(y) - P_N(y)| dy + \frac{L}{A} \ll \frac{1}{A}$$

and this can be made smaller than ε by choosing A large enough, independently of N . \square

Remark. The proof goes similarly for vector-valued B^1 almost-periodic functions, as in [1, Theorem 2.9].

The key argument in the above proof was Prohorov's theorem, or Helly's selection theorem, but this is an indirect argument. Our goal is now to give a more explicit description of the random variable S in terms of the function F . We can do so thanks to our explicit version of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem. Also, moment estimates such as Chebyshev's inequality can prove very useful to obtain bounds on $\lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x>0}(F(y)) dy$ (when it exists, see Corollary 1.26 below), so we would like to have at least the first two moments of S at our disposal. This is possible at the cost of assuming additional hypotheses on the coefficients a_n of the function F , and on the linear relations between the almost-periods of F , *i.e.* the elements of the support $\Lambda(F)$ of F . We give below two distinct hypotheses that allow us to compute the second moment.

Let $\theta = (\theta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of pairwise distinct positive real numbers and for any $N \geq 1$ let $\Theta_N = \{\theta_n \mid n \leq N\}$ and $\Theta = \bigcup_{N \geq 1} \Theta_N$. We are going to do an analysis close to what we did in the previous sections, but we alter our notations to take into account the infinite number of θ_n 's. Define inductively $\mathcal{B}_1 := \{\theta_1\}$ and for $N \geq 2$,

$$\mathcal{B}_N := \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_{N-1} & \text{if } \theta_N \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Theta_{N-1}) \\ \mathcal{B}_{N-1} \cup \{\theta_N\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We let $\mathcal{B} := \bigcup_{N \geq 1} \mathcal{B}_N$, so that \mathcal{B} is a basis of $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta$. For any $j \geq 1$, write the decomposition of θ_j in \mathcal{B} as

$$\theta_j = \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} c_{\theta,j} \theta$$

and let d_j be the least common multiple of the denominators of the $c_{\theta,k}$ (written in irreducible form), for $\theta \in \mathcal{B}_j$ and $k \leq j$. Since the sequence of sets $(\mathcal{B}_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is increasing, we see that d_j really only depends on j .

Definition 1.18. Let $(Z_\theta)_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}}$ be a sequence of independent random variables, uniform on \mathbb{T} . For any $N \geq 1$ and $n \leq N$, let

$$Z_{n,N} = \prod_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} Z_\theta^{d_N c_{\theta,n}}.$$

Notice that, by definition, $d_N c_{n,\theta} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $n \leq N$, and that for every $n \geq 1$, $c_{\theta,n} = 0$ for all but finitely many $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$, so the above product is a finite product.

Lemma 1.19. *Let $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{C})$ and for every $N \geq 1$,*

$$S_{\Theta_N} := c + \sum_{n \leq N} a_n Z_{n,N} + \overline{a_n \overline{Z_{n,N}}}.$$

Assume that no θ_n is an integer multiple of another, that is for every $i, j \geq 1$ with $i \neq j$, we have $\theta_i \notin \theta_j \mathbb{Z}$. Then $(S_{\Theta_N})_{N \geq 1}$ converges in L^2 .

Proof. Since L^2 is complete, it is enough to prove that $(S_{\Theta_N})_{N \geq 1}$ is Cauchy in L^2 . Let $m > n \geq 1$, then

$$\mathbb{E}(|S_{\Theta_m} - S_{\Theta_n}|^2) = \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sum_{k=1}^m (a_k Z_{k,m} + \overline{a_k \overline{Z_{k,m}}}) - \sum_{k=1}^n (a_k Z_{k,n} + \overline{a_k \overline{Z_{k,n}}}) \right|^2 \right).$$

Expanding the square, we end up with terms of twelve different kinds : $a_k a_j \mathbb{E}(Z_{k,p} Z_{j,p})$, $a_k \overline{a_j} \mathbb{E}(Z_{k,p} \overline{Z_{j,p}})$ for $p \in \{m, n\}$ and $1 \leq j, k \leq p$, $-a_k a_j \mathbb{E}(Z_{k,m} Z_{j,n})$, $-a_k \overline{a_j} \mathbb{E}(Z_{k,m} \overline{Z_{j,n}})$ for $1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$ and their conjugates. Each $Z_{k,p}$ is uniform on \mathbb{T} and the product of two uniform random variables on \mathbb{T} is either 1 or uniform on \mathbb{T} , in which case it has mean zero. Thus, it is enough to detect in which of the above cases we end up with 1.

- For $p \in \{m, n\}$ and $1 \leq j, k \leq p$ we have

$$Z_{k,p} Z_{j,p} = \prod_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} Z_{\theta}^{d_p(c_{\theta,k} + c_{\theta,j})}.$$

Since the $Z_{\theta}, \theta \in \mathcal{B}$ are independent, this product is (almost-surely) 1 if and only if $d_p(c_{\theta,k} + c_{\theta,j}) = 0$ for every $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$. By definition, this means that $\theta_j = -\theta_k$ which can't be because each θ_n is positive. So those terms contribute 0.

- Similarly, we have

$$Z_{k,p} \overline{Z_{j,p}} = \prod_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} Z_{\theta}^{d_p(c_{\theta,k} - c_{\theta,j})}.$$

This is equal to 1 when $j = k$, but when $j \neq k$ there is at least one non-zero exponent since the θ_n 's are pairwise distinct.

- Now for $1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$Z_{k,m} Z_{j,n} = \prod_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} Z_{\theta}^{d_m c_{\theta,k} + d_n c_{\theta,j}}.$$

As before, this is 1 if and only if $\theta_k = -\frac{d_n}{d_m} \theta_j$, which can't be since the θ_n 's are positive.

- Finally for $1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$Z_{k,m} \overline{Z_{j,n}} = \prod_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} Z_{\theta}^{d_m c_{\theta,k} - d_n c_{\theta,j}},$$

and this is 1 if and only if $\theta_j = \frac{d_m}{d_n} \theta_k$. But by definition, d_n divides d_m for $m > n$, so by hypothesis on the θ_n 's the previous equality can only happen if and only if $k = j$.

Gathering everything, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(|S_{\Theta_m} - S_{\Theta_n}|^2) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^m |a_k|^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^2 - 4 \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^2 = 2 \sum_{k=n+1}^m |a_k|^2.$$

Since $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{C})$, this proves that $(S_{\Theta_N})_{N \geq 1}$ is Cauchy for the L^2 norm. \square

If the sequence $(d_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is bounded, it is stationary since it is non-decreasing. In that case, we let d be its limit and $N_0 \geq 1$ be such that $d_N = d$ for every $N \geq N_0$. Then $Z_{n,N} = Z_{n,N_0}$ for any $N \geq \max(N_0, n)$, so for any $n \geq 1$ we let $Z_n := Z_{n,N_0}$. With these notations, we can now state the following result.

Lemma 1.20. *Let $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{C})$ and for every $N \geq 1$,*

$$S_{\Theta_N} := c + \sum_{n \leq N} a_n Z_{n,N} + \overline{a_n Z_{n,N}}.$$

Assume that $(d_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is bounded. Then $(S_{\Theta_N})_{N \geq 1}$ converges in L^2 .

Proof. The proof is made easier in this case by the fact that $S_{\Theta_m} - S_{\Theta_n} = \sum_{k=n+1}^m (a_k Z_k + \overline{a_k Z_k})$, and those are easily seen to be pairwise orthogonal. We conclude exactly as in the previous proof. \square

Corollary 1.21. *Let $F \sim c + \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n e^{i\theta_n t} + \overline{a_n} e^{-i\theta_n t}$ be B^1 almost-periodic (see Theorem 1.17), where $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{C})$. Assume either that no θ_i is an integer multiple of another or that $(d_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is bounded. Then we can choose $S_{\Theta} := \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} c + \sum_{n \leq N} a_n Z_{n,N} + \overline{a_n Z_{n,N}}$ (the limit being taken in L^2 norm) in the conclusion of Theorem 1.17, i.e. for every bounded continuous function g on \mathbb{R} , one has*

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X g(F(y)) dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(g(S_{\Theta})).$$

Moreover, we have $\mathbb{E}(S_{\Theta}) = c$ and $\text{Var}(S_{\Theta}) = 2 \sum_{n \geq 1} |a_n|^2$.

Remark. The above notation \sim does not necessarily mean that the series for F converges pointwise to F . It only means that its partial sums converge to F for the B^1 semi-norm.

Proof. The first part is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.17 and the previous two lemmas. The last two formulas are straightforward. \square

Remark.

- i) It is tempting to say that $(S_{\Theta_N})_{N \geq 1}$ converges to S_{Θ} in L^1 under no other hypothesis than F being B^1 almost-periodic, since $\limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X |F(y) - P_N(y)| dy$ goes to zero as N tends to infinity. However we don't know if the previous quantity equals $\mathbb{E}(|S_{\Theta} - S_{\Theta_N}|)$.
- ii) If the θ_n 's are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , so that $\mathcal{B} = \Theta$, then the Z_n 's are pairwise independent, and one can prove the almost-sure convergence of $(S_{\Theta_N})_{N \geq 1}$ by Kolmogorov's two series theorem for example (see [13, Theorem 2.5.6]). The almost-sure convergence does not immediately follow from the assumption that the series for $F(t)$ converges for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$: the set $\Gamma := \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta t} \right)_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$ is easily seen to be dense in $\mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{B}}$ as a consequence of the continuous version of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem, but it has measure zero. By the Riesz-Fischer theorem, we at least know that $(S_{\Theta_N})_{N \geq 1}$ admits an almost-surely converging subsequence.

The next step in our analysis is to pass from bounded Lipschitz functions to indicator functions of sets defined by strict inequalities. Mimicking the proof of Theorem 1.9, we obtain the following.

Proposition 1.22. *Let $F_1, \dots, F_D : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be B^1 almost-periodic functions with $\Lambda(F_j) \subset \Theta$ for $1 \leq j \leq D$. Let S_1, \dots, S_D be the random variables associated to F_1, \dots, F_D in Theorem 1.17. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S_1 > \dots > S_D) &\leq \liminf_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D}(F_1(y), \dots, F_D(y)) \, dy \\ &\leq \limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D}(F_1(y), \dots, F_D(y)) \, dy \leq \mathbb{P}(S_1 \geq \dots \geq S_D). \end{aligned}$$

Remark. We cannot expect an equality without any hypothesis on Θ . For instance, consider the case $D = 2$, $F_2 = 0$ and F_1 a non-zero continuous function with compact support on \mathbb{R} . For a less trivial example, we can use an everywhere converging Fourier series with a locally constant sum.

We now look for conditions on Θ to imply equality in the previous Proposition. Such a condition was found by Devin in [10] : if $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta$ decomposes as a direct sum $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} T \oplus \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Theta \setminus T)$, where T is a finite subset of Θ , then the random variable associated to a non-constant B^1 almost-periodic function S as in Theorem 1.17 does not admit atoms. Note that this hypothesis on $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta$ is a weakening of the hypothesis of the existence of "self-sufficient zeros" in [16]. The proof of Devin consists in showing that the characteristic function of S is decaying sufficiently fast at infinity, by using known bounds on oscillatory integrals, and then using a lemma of Wiener, relating this decay to the continuity of the distribution of S (see the proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 in [10]). Our method allows us to show the same thing but with a considerably simpler proof thanks to Lemma 1.13.

Theorem 1.23 (Devin). *Assume $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Theta) = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m) \oplus \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\{\theta_n \mid n > m\})$. Let $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\|F - P_N\|_{B^1} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0$ where*

$$P_n : t \mapsto c + \sum_{n \leq N} a_n e^{i\theta_n t} + \overline{a_n} e^{-i\theta_n t}.$$

*Let μ_F, μ_{F-P_m} and μ_{P_m} be the limiting distributions of $F, F - P_m$ and P_m respectively. Then $\mu_F = \mu_{F-P_m} * \mu_{P_m}$. In particular, if P_m is not constant, then $\mu_F(\{x\}) = 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. The function F and $R = F - P_m$ are B^1 -almost periodic functions, and therefore admit limiting distributions μ_F and μ_R by Theorem 1.17. On the other hand, P_m also admits a limiting distribution because of Theorem 1.5, say μ_{P_m} .

For $N > m$, let $P'_N : t \mapsto \sum_{m < n \leq N} a_n e^{i\theta_n t} + \overline{a_n} e^{-i\theta_n t}$. Just as P_m , those admit limiting distributions $\mu_{P'_N}$ and by the proof of Theorem 1.17, $(\mu_{P'_N})_{N > m}$ converges weakly to μ_R . Also, for every $N > m$, $\mu_{P'_N + P_m} = \mu_{P'_N} * \mu_{P_m}$ because, by construction and the hypothesis on $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta$, every $Z_{n,N}, 1 \leq n \leq m$ is independent of every $Z_{n',N}, m < n' \leq N$. As above, $(\mu_{P'_N + P_m})_{N > m}$ converges weakly to μ_F .

For any Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R} , let $\hat{\mu}$ be its characteristic function. Then for every $N > m$, $\widehat{\mu_{P'_N} * \mu_{P_m}} = \hat{\mu}_{P'_N} \hat{\mu}_{P_m}$ and this converges pointwise to $\hat{\mu}_R \hat{\mu}_{P_m} = \widehat{\mu_R * \mu_{P_m}}$. By Lévy's continuity theorem ([13, Theorem 3.3.17]), this means that $(\mu_{P'_N} * \mu_{P_m})_{N > m}$ converges weakly to $\mu_R * \mu_{P_m}$. Therefore we have proved that $\mu_F = \mu_R * \mu_{P_m}$.

Now if P_m is not constant, then by Lemma 1.13, we have $\mu_{P_m}(\{y\}) = 0$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, and thus for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mu_F(\{x\}) = (\mu_R * \mu_{P_m})(\{x\}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mu_{P_m}(\{x - y\}) \, d\mu_R(y) = 0.$$

□

Combining the previous Theorem with Proposition 1.22 we obtain the following.

Corollary 1.24. *Assume $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} T \oplus \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Theta \setminus T)$ for some non-empty finite subset T of Θ . Let $F_1, \dots, F_D : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be B^1 almost-periodic functions such that for $1 \leq j \leq D$, $F_j \sim c_j + \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} a_{\theta,j} e^{i\theta t} + \overline{a_{\theta,j}} e^{-i\theta t}$. Let S_1, \dots, S_D be the random variables associated to F_1, \dots, F_D in Theorem 1.17. If for every $1 \leq j \leq D-1$, the function $t \mapsto \sum_{\theta \in T} (a_{\theta,j} - a_{\theta,j+1}) e^{i\theta y} + (\overline{a_{\theta,j}} - \overline{a_{\theta,j+1}}) e^{-i\theta y}$ is not constant, then*

$$\lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D}(F_1(y), \dots, F_D(y)) dy = \mathbb{P}(S_1 > \dots > S_D).$$

The condition that a certain linear combination of $e^{i\theta t}$ is not constant can be easily translated by the non-vanishing of its coefficients.

Lemma 1.25. *Let T be a finite subset of Θ and for each $\theta \in T$, let $a_{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}$. If the function $t \mapsto \sum_{\theta \in T} a_{\theta} e^{i\theta t} + \overline{a_{\theta}} e^{-i\theta t}$ is constant then $a_{\theta} = 0$ for every $\theta \in T$.*

Proof. Let $P : t \mapsto \sum_{\theta \in T} a_{\theta} e^{i\theta t} + \overline{a_{\theta}} e^{-i\theta t}$ and assume it is constant. Then all of its derivatives are zero. In particular, we have for $1 \leq k \leq 2\#T$,

$$P^{(k)}(0) = \sum_{\theta \in T} (a_{\theta} + (-1)^k \overline{a_{\theta}}) \theta^k = 0,$$

which means that $(a_{\theta} + \overline{a_{\theta}})_{\theta \in T}$ and $(a_{\theta} - \overline{a_{\theta}})_{\theta \in T}$ are both solutions of Vandermonde linear systems with non-zero determinant since the elements of Θ , and therefore of T , are non-zero and pairwise distinct. This implies $a_{\theta} = \overline{a_{\theta}}$ and $a_{\theta} = -\overline{a_{\theta}}$ for every $\theta \in T$, and thus $a_{\theta} = 0$ for every $\theta \in T$. □

Corollary 1.26. *Assume $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} T \oplus \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Theta \setminus T)$ for some non-empty finite subset T of Θ . Let $F_1, \dots, F_D : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be B^1 almost-periodic functions such that for $1 \leq j \leq D$, $F_j \sim c_j + \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} a_{\theta,j} e^{i\theta t} + \overline{a_{\theta,j}} e^{-i\theta t}$. Let S_1, \dots, S_D be the random variables associated to F_1, \dots, F_D in Theorem 1.17. If for every $1 \leq j \leq D-1$, there exists $\theta \in T$ such that $a_{\theta,j} \neq a_{\theta,j+1}$ then*

$$\lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{x_1 > \dots > x_D}(F_1(y), \dots, F_D(y)) dy = \mathbb{P}(S_1 > \dots > S_D).$$

Proof. Simply combine the previous two results. □

1.5 Quantities with an error term

We now investigate to what extent Corollary 1.4, Theorem 1.9, Theorem 1.14 and Corollary 1.26 still hold for functions with an extra error term. To simplify notations, when G_1, \dots, G_D are functions and \mathcal{R} is a D -ary relation (\mathcal{R} will be $\{(x_1, \dots, x_D) \in \mathbb{R}^D \mid x_1 > \dots > x_D\}$ or $\{(x_1, \dots, x_D) \in \mathbb{R}^D \mid x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_D\}$ below), we set

$$\underline{\delta}(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D)) := \liminf_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \#\{n \in \{1, \dots, X\} \mid \mathcal{R}(G_1(n), \dots, G_D(n))\}$$

and

$$\overline{\delta}(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D)) := \limsup_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \#\{n \in \{1, \dots, X\} \mid \mathcal{R}(G_1(n), \dots, G_D(n))\}$$

When $\underline{\delta}(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D)) = \overline{\delta}(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D))$ we denote by $\delta(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D))$ their common value.

Theorem 1.27. Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers and $f_1, \dots, f_D \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ be real-valued and without pole on \mathbb{T}^r . Let $G : t \mapsto (F_1(t), \dots, F_D(t)) + r(t)$ where $F_j(t) = f_j(e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t})$ for $1 \leq j \leq D$, and $r(t) = (r_1(t), \dots, r_D(t)) = o(1)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

i) *Degenerate case* : Assume that $\theta_i \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(Z_\theta)) &\leq \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \\ &\leq \bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \leq \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) \geq \dots \geq f_D(Z_\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if for every $1 \leq j \leq D-1$ and every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ one has $F_j(n) \neq F_{j+1}(n)$, then $\delta(G_1 > \dots > G_D)$ exists and we have

$$\delta(G_1 > \dots > G_D) = \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(Z_\theta)).$$

ii) *Non-degenerate case* : Assume $\theta_i \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) &\leq \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \\ &\leq \bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) \geq \dots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if for every $1 \leq j \leq D-1$ and $0 \leq a \leq d-1$, there exists $n \equiv a \pmod{d}$ such that $F_j(n) \neq F_{j+1}(n)$, then $\delta(G_1 > \dots > G_D)$ exists and

$$\delta(G_1 > \dots > G_D) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)).$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $n_0 \geq 1$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$, we have $|r_j(n)| < \varepsilon$. Now for every $n \geq n_0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(n) > F_2(n) + 2\varepsilon > \dots > F_D(n) + 2(D-1)\varepsilon &\Rightarrow G_1(n) > G_2(n) > \dots > G_D(n) \\ &\Rightarrow F_1(n) > F_2(n) - 2\varepsilon > \dots > F_D(n) - 2(D-1)\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

In the degenerate case, this implies by Proposition 1.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(Z_\theta) + 2(D-1)\varepsilon) &\leq \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \\ &\leq \bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \leq \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(Z_\theta) - 2(D-1)\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

while in the non-degenerate case, this implies by Theorem 1.9

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) + 2(D-1)\varepsilon) &\leq \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \\ &\leq \bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) - 2(D-1)\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we obtain the announced inequalities on $\underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D)$ and $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D)$ by letting ε tend to 0 as in the proof of Theorem 1.9.

Finally, the last hypotheses imply that $\mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(Z_\theta)) = \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) \geq \dots \geq f_D(Z_\theta))$ in the degenerate case since Z_θ is uniform on $\langle \nu_\theta \rangle$, while they imply $\mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) >$

$\cdots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) \geq \cdots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta))$ for every $0 \leq a \leq D - 1$ in the non-degenerate case because of Lemma 1.8. \square

The proof of the next theorem is completely similar, based on Theorem 1.14 and Corollary 1.26. This time, $\delta(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D))$ means, when it exists,

$$\lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_0^X \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}(G_1(y), \dots, G_D(y))} dy,$$

and $\underline{\delta}(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D))$ and $\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{R}(G_1, \dots, G_D))$ the corresponding lim inf and lim sup.

Theorem 1.28. *i) Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$ be real numbers, $f_1, \dots, f_D \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ be pairwise distinct and real-valued on \mathbb{T}^r . Let $G : t \mapsto (F_1(t), \dots, F_D(t)) + o(1)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, where $F_j(t) = f_j(e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t})$ for $1 \leq j \leq D$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \cdots > f_D(Z_\theta)) &\leq \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) \\ &\leq \bar{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) \leq \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) \geq \cdots \geq f_D(Z_\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if for every $1 \leq j \leq D - 1$, there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_j(y) \neq F_{j+1}(y)$, then $\delta(G_1 > \cdots > G_D)$ exists and we have

$$\delta(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) = \mathbb{P}(f_1(Z_\theta) > \cdots > f_D(Z_\theta)).$$

ii) Let $\theta = (\theta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of pairwise distinct positive real numbers and $\Theta = \{\theta_n \mid n \geq 1\}$. Let $F_1, \dots, F_D : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be B^1 almost-periodic functions such that for $1 \leq j \leq D$, $F_j \sim c_j + \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} a_{\theta,j} e^{i\theta t} + \bar{a}_{\theta,j} e^{-i\theta t}$ and $G : t \mapsto (F_1(t), \dots, F_D(t)) + o(1)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Then, with S_1, \dots, S_D the random variables associated to F_1, \dots, F_D in Theorem 1.17, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S_1 > \cdots > S_D) &\leq \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) \\ &\leq \bar{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) \leq \mathbb{P}(S_1 \geq \cdots \geq S_D). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} T \oplus \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Theta \setminus T)$ for some non-empty finite subset T of Θ , and if for every $1 \leq j \leq D - 1$, there exists $\theta \in T$ such that $a_{\theta,j} \neq a_{\theta,j+1}$, then $\delta(G_1 > \cdots > G_D)$ exists and

$$\delta(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) = \mathbb{P}(S_1 > \cdots > S_D).$$

Let us provide a consequence of the above result for prime number races over number fields with any number of participants. Using the explicit formula [17, (5.12)] and Theorem 1.28 ii), we obtain the following.

Theorem 1.29. *Let L/K be a Galois extension of number fields, with Galois group G . Assume ζ_L satisfies the Riemann Hypothesis. Let Θ be the set of positive imaginary parts of the non-trivial zeros of Artin L -functions attached to irreducible complex characters of G , and assume that $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Theta = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}} T \oplus \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Theta \setminus T)$ for some non-empty finite subset T of Θ . Let C_1, \dots, C_D be distinct conjugacy classes of G . If for every $1 \leq j \leq D - 1$, there exists $\theta \in T$ such that*

$$\sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \text{ord}_{s=\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma} L(s, \chi) (\chi(C_j) - \chi(C_{j+1})) \neq 0$$

then the logarithmic density

$$\delta(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D) := \lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{X} \int_2^X \mathbf{1}_{\pi_{C_1}(e^t) > \cdots > \pi_{C_D}(e^t)} dt$$

exists.

Remark.

- i) Using the unconditional explicit formula from [14, Corollary 3.10], we could provide a similar statement for the existence of the above logarithmic density, under a suitable hypothesis of non-vanishing coefficient as above and without assuming the Riemann Hypothesis for ζ_L .
- ii) Because of the special properties of Artin L -functions with respect to induction of characters, one could state a linear independence hypothesis about the set of zeros of Artin L -functions attached to irreducible complex characters of G^+ instead, where G^+ is the Galois group of the Galois closure of L over \mathbb{Q} . That this is a more natural set of zeros to consider was noted by the author, and used for the first time in [14].

2 Applications

2.1 Non-critical densities

We give sufficient conditions for the densities we study to be positive.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers. Let $f_1, \dots, f_D, F_1, \dots, F_D$ and G_1, \dots, G_D be as in Theorem 1.27.*

- i) *Degenerate case : Assume that $\theta_i \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. If there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)$, then $0 < \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D)$ and if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) \geq \dots \geq F_D(n)$ does not hold, then $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) < 1$.*
- ii) *Non-degenerate case : Assume $\theta_i \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. If there exist $a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and $z \in H_\theta$ such that $f_1(\nu_\theta^a z) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a z)$ then $0 < \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D)$. Also, if there exist $a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and $z \in H_\theta$ such that $f_1(\nu_\theta^a z) \geq \dots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a z)$ does not hold, then $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) > 1$. In particular, if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)$, then $0 < \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D)$, and if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) \geq \dots \geq F_D(n)$ does not hold, then $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \dots > G_D) < 1$.*

Proof.

- i) It is immediate by Corollary 1.4 and Theorem 1.27 i).
- ii) Assume that there exist $a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and $z \in H_\theta$ such that $f_1(\nu_\theta^a z) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a z)$. By continuity of f_1, \dots, f_D , there exists an open subset U of H_θ such that $z \in U$ and for all $z' \in U$, $f_1(\nu_\theta^a z') > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a z')$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) &\geq \mathbb{P}(Z_\theta \in U) \\ &= \mathbb{P}((Z_1, \dots, Z_m) \in \varphi^{-1}(U)) \\ &= \lambda(\varphi^{-1}(U)) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where φ is the continuous map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}^m &\longrightarrow H_\theta \\ \varphi : (z_1, \dots, z_m) &\mapsto \left(z_1^d, \dots, z_m^d, \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,m+1}}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^m z_k^{h_{k,r}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and λ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^m . By Theorem 1.27 ii), we obtain $\underline{\delta}(F_1 > \dots > F_D) \geq \frac{\mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta))}{d} > 0$. The proof of the second statement is similar since the negation of $f_1(\nu_\theta^a z) \geq \dots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a z)$ is also an open condition on z .

The last statement is immediate since, if $n \equiv a \pmod{d}$, then $(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n}) = \nu_\theta^a z$ for some $z \in H_\theta$ by construction.

□

Remark.

- i) In the degenerate case, we actually have the lower bound $\frac{1}{d} \leq \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D)$ whenever $\underline{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) > 0$, and the upper bound $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{d}$ whenever $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) < 1$.
- ii) The converses of the above statements are false in general. For example it may happen that $f_1(z) = \cdots = f_D(z)$ for every $z \in \mathbb{T}^r$, but $\underline{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) > 0$ because $r_1(n) > \cdots > r_D(n)$ for a positive proportion of $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The continuous version of the above Proposition is proved in the same way as *ii*) above.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers. Let $f_1, \dots, f_D, F_1, \dots, F_D$ and G be as in Theorem 1.28 i). If there exists $z \in H_\theta$ such that $f_1(z) > \cdots > f_D(z)$ then $0 < \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D)$. Also, if there exists $z \in H_\theta$ such that $f_1(z) \geq \cdots \geq f_D(z)$ does not hold, then $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) > 1$. In particular, if there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_1(y) > \cdots > F_D(y)$, then $0 < \underline{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D)$, and if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) \geq \cdots \geq F_D(n)$ does not hold, then $\bar{\delta}(G_1 > \cdots > G_D) < 1$.*

Remark. In the infinite-dimensional case, the only known lower bounds on the density are shown in particular cases by using delicate combinatorial arguments (*cf.* [20, 2.2] and [9, Theorem 2.5.1 (1)]).

2.2 Prime divisor races over global function fields

We now give an application of the previous results to the study of prime divisor races over global function field extensions.

Let L/K be a geometric Galois extension of function fields, with constant field \mathbb{F}_q , the finite field with q elements, *i.e.* K is a finitely generated extension of \mathbb{F}_q , has transcendence degree 1 over \mathbb{F}_q , \mathbb{F}_q is algebraically closed in K and L/K is Galois. We let g_K and g_L denote the genus of K and L respectively. Let C_1, \dots, C_D be $D \geq 1$ distinct conjugacy classes of $G := \text{Gal}(L/K)$. Define

$$\pi_{C_i}(n) := \#\{P \text{ prime divisor of } K \text{ unramified in } L \mid \deg(P) = n, \text{Frob}_P = C_i\},$$

where Frob_P denotes the Frobenius conjugacy class of P in G . The Chebotarev density theorem ([19, Theorem 9.13B]) states that

$$\pi_{C_i}(n) = \frac{|C_i|}{|G|} \frac{q^n}{n} + O\left(\frac{q^{n/2}}{n}\right).$$

This shows that

$$\frac{\pi_{C_i}(n)}{|C_i|} \underset{n \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \frac{\pi_{C_j}(n)}{|C_j|}$$

for any two $i \neq j$, but we want to compare those two quantities beyond this first order asymptotic. The question is, how often can it happen that

$$\frac{\pi_{C_1}(n)}{|C_1|} > \cdots > \frac{\pi_{C_D}(n)}{|C_D|} ?$$

More precisely, we are interested in the following density, provided it exists,

$$\delta(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D) := \lim_{X \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\#\{n \leq X \mid \frac{\pi_{C_1}(n)}{|C_1|} > \dots > \frac{\pi_{C_D}(n)}{|C_D|}\}}{X}.$$

When studying the densities $\delta(L/K; C_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, C_{\sigma(D)})$ for every permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, D\}$, we say we study the prime divisor race between C_1, \dots, C_D . As usual, we will denote by $\bar{\delta}(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D)$ the corresponding lim inf and lim sup.

To study the above densities, we use the Artin L -functions associated to irreducible characters of G . If χ is such a character, one has the following convenient expression :

$$\log L(s, \chi) = \sum_P \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\chi(P^n) q^{-n \deg(P)s}}{n}$$

for $\Re(s) > 1$, where $\chi(P^n)$ is a short way of writing

$$\frac{1}{e(P)} \sum_{j=1}^{e(P)} \chi((g_j \text{Frob}_P)^n).$$

Here, $e(P)$ is the ramification index of P in L , and $g_1, \dots, g_{e(P)}$ are the elements of the inertia subgroup $I(\mathfrak{P})$, for any prime \mathfrak{P} of L dividing P (recall that those quantities only depend on P up to conjugacy, so the above summands are well-defined since χ is a central function on G).

It is convenient to move from the variable s to the variable $u := q^{-s}$, and to write $\mathcal{L}(u, \chi) := L(s, \chi)$. Then one has the following important theorem ([19, Theorems 9.16A and 9.16B]) :

Theorem 2.3 (Artin, Weil). *The function $L(s, \chi_0)$, where χ_0 is the trivial character of G , is the zeta function ζ_K of K , which is a rational function in u with integer coefficients :*

$$\zeta_K(s) = \mathcal{L}(u, \chi_0) = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{2g_K} (1 - \gamma(\chi_0, j)u)}{(1-u)(1-qu)}.$$

If $\chi \neq \chi_0$ is a non-trivial irreducible character of G , then $\mathcal{L}(u, \chi)$ is a polynomial in u with integer coefficients :

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \chi) = \prod_{j=1}^{M_\chi} (1 - \gamma(\chi, j)u)$$

for some integer $M_\chi \geq 0$. The $\gamma(\chi, j)$ are called the inverse zeros of $\mathcal{L}(u, \chi)$ and have absolute value \sqrt{q} (Riemann Hypothesis for curves over \mathbb{F}_q). Moreover, if γ is an inverse zero of $\mathcal{L}(u, \chi)$ then $\frac{q}{\gamma} = \bar{\gamma}$ is an inverse zero of $\mathcal{L}(u, \bar{\chi})$.

The last statement of the theorem is a simple consequence of the functional equation satisfied by Artin L -functions, which we do not formulate here (for non-trivial characters, one has to combine the functional equation of Hecke L -series and Brauer's induction theorem as in the case of Artin L -functions over number fields [5, p.81-83]).

We now make some preliminary work to study the prime divisor races in L/K . We let C be a conjugacy class of G .

On the one hand, by the definition of Artin L -functions, one has

$$u \frac{d}{du} \log \mathcal{L}(u, \chi) = \sum_P \sum_{n \geq 1} \deg P \chi(P^n) u^{n \deg P} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\sum_{\substack{P \\ \deg P | n}} \deg P \chi(P^{\frac{n}{\deg P}}) \right) u^n.$$

On the other hand, from the above factorisations, we obtain

$$u \frac{d}{du} \log \mathcal{L}(u, \chi_0) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(q^n + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{2g_K} \gamma(\chi, j)^n \right) u^n$$

and for $\chi \neq \chi_0$

$$u \frac{d}{du} \log \mathcal{L}(u, \chi) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(- \sum_{j=1}^{M_\chi} \gamma(\chi, j)^n \right) u^n.$$

Writing

$$u \frac{d}{du} \log \mathcal{L}(u, \chi) = \sum_{n \geq 1} c_n(\chi) u^n,$$

and using the second orthogonality relations on characters, we find from the first formula for $c_n(\chi)$ above that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\chi} \overline{\chi(C)} c_n(\chi) &= \sum_{\substack{P \\ \deg P | n}} \deg P \sum_{\chi} \chi(P^{\frac{n}{\deg P}}) \overline{\chi(C)} \\ &= \frac{\#G}{\#C} \sum_{d|n} d \#\{P \mid \deg P = d, \text{Frob}_P^{\frac{n}{d}} \subset C\} \\ &= \frac{\#G}{\#C} n \pi_C(n) + R_C(n) + O(q^{n/3}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_C(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{2} \frac{\#G}{\#C} \#\{P \mid \deg P = \frac{n}{2}, \text{Frob}_P^2 \subset C\} & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using now the second formula for $c_n(\chi)$ above, we obtain

$$\sum_{\chi} \overline{\chi(C)} c_n(\chi) = q^n + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{2g_K} \gamma(\chi_0, j)^n - \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \overline{\chi(C)} \sum_{j=1}^{M_\chi} \gamma(\chi, j)^n.$$

Combining those formulas we obtain

$$\frac{\#G}{\#C} \pi_C(n) = \frac{q^n}{n} - \frac{R_C(n)}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{2g_K} \gamma(\chi_0, j)^n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \overline{\chi(C)} \sum_{j=1}^{M_\chi} \gamma(\chi, j)^n + O\left(\frac{q^{n/3}}{n}\right).$$

We now introduce $C^{1/2} := \{g \in G \mid g^2 \in C\}$, and remark it is stable by conjugation in G , so it is the disjoint union of conjugacy classes D_1, \dots, D_t of G , and $\#\{P \mid \deg P = \frac{n}{2}, \text{Frob}_P^2 \subset C\} = \sum_{i=1}^t \pi_{D_i}(\frac{n}{2}) = \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{\#D_i}{\#G} \frac{2}{n} q^{n/2} + O(q^{n/4}) = \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{\#G} \frac{2}{n} q^{n/2} + O(q^{n/4})$ by the above formula.

This shows that

$$R_C(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{\#C} q^{n/2} + O(q^{n/4}) & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} = \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{2\#C} q^{n/2} + \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{2\#C} q^{n/2} e^{i\pi n} + O(q^{n/4}).$$

Finally, we have

$$\frac{\#G}{\#C} \pi_C(n) = \frac{q^n}{n} - \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{\#C} \frac{q^{n/2}}{2n} - \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{\#C} \frac{q^{n/2}}{2n} e^{i\pi n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{2g_K} \gamma(\chi_0, j)^n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \overline{\chi(C)} \sum_{j=1}^{M_\chi} \gamma(\chi, j)^n + O\left(\frac{q^{n/3}}{n}\right).$$

Similarly, with $\pi_K(n) := \#\{P \mid \deg P = n\}$, one has

$$\pi_K(n) = \frac{q^n}{n} - \frac{q^{n/2}}{2n} - e^{i\pi n} \frac{q^{n/2}}{2n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{2g_K} \gamma(\chi_0, j)^n + O\left(q^{n/3}\right).$$

Combining those formulas, we obtain

$$\frac{n}{q^{n/2}} \left(\frac{\#G}{\#C} \pi_C(n) - \pi_K(n) \right) = \frac{1 - \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{\#C}}{2} + \frac{1 - \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{\#C}}{2} e^{i\pi n} - \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \frac{M_\chi}{\chi(C)} \sum_{j=1}^{M_\chi} \left(\frac{\gamma(\chi, j)}{\sqrt{q}} \right)^n + o(1)$$

as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

Grouping pairs of conjugate inverse zeros we have shown :

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r$ be the inverse zeros with positive imaginary part of the $\mathcal{L}(u, \chi)$, for $\chi \neq \chi_0$, counted without multiplicity. For $1 \leq j \leq r$, write $\gamma_j = \sqrt{q}e^{i\theta_j}$. Then for any conjugacy class C of G we have*

$$\frac{n}{q^{n/2}} \left(\frac{\#G}{\#C} \pi_C(n) - \pi_K(n) \right) = r_C + z_C + a_\pi(C) e^{i\pi n} - \sum_{j=1}^r \left(a_j(C) e^{i\theta_j n} + \overline{a_j(C)} e^{-i\theta_j n} \right) + o(1)$$

as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, where

$$r_C := \frac{1 - \frac{\#(C^{1/2})}{\#C}}{2},$$

$$z_C := - \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \overline{\chi(C)} \text{ord}_{u=q^{-1/2}} \mathcal{L}(u, \chi),$$

$$a_\pi(C) = r_C - \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \overline{\chi(C)} \text{ord}_{u=-q^{-1/2}} \mathcal{L}(u, \chi),$$

and for $1 \leq j \leq r$,

$$a_j(C) := \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \overline{\chi(C)} \text{ord}_{u=\gamma_j^{-1}} \mathcal{L}(u, \chi).$$

We have thus shown that a suitable rescaling of $\pi_C(n)$ is of the form we studied in the previous sections. The rescaling of $\frac{\pi_C(n)}{\#C}$ does not depend on C , so that will allow us to study prime divisor races between conjugacy classes of G .

Theorem 2.5. *Let C_1, \dots, C_D be conjugacy classes of G . For $1 \leq j \leq D$, let $f_j = r_{C_j} + z_{C_j} + a_\pi(C_j) \frac{X_{r+1} + X_{r+1}^{-1}}{2} - \sum_{k=1}^r \left(a_k(C_j) X_j + \overline{a_k(C_j)} X_j^{-1} \right) \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_{r+1})$ and $F_j : t \mapsto f_j \left(e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t}, e^{i\pi t} \right)$.*

- i) *Degenerate case : Assume $\theta_i \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$, i.e. that each $\mathcal{L}(u, \chi)$, $\chi \neq \chi_0$, is a product of cyclotomic polynomials. If there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)$, then $0 < \underline{\delta}(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D)$ and if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) \geq \dots \geq F_D(n)$ does not hold, then $\overline{\delta}(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D) < 1$. Moreover, if for $1 \leq j \leq D-1$, and for $0 \leq n \leq d-1$, one has $F_j(n) \neq F_{j+1}(n)$, then $\delta(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D)$ exists.*
- ii) *Non-degenerate case : Assume $\theta_i \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. If there exist $a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and $z \in H_\theta$ such that $f_1(\nu_\theta^a z) > \dots > f_D(\nu_\theta^a z)$ then $0 < \underline{\delta}(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D)$. Also, if there exist $a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and $z \in H_\theta$ such that $f_1(\nu_\theta^a z) \geq \dots \geq f_D(\nu_\theta^a z)$ does not hold, then $\overline{\delta}(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D) < 1$. In particular, if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) > \dots > F_D(n)$, then $0 < \underline{\delta}(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D)$, and if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $F_1(n) \geq \dots \geq F_D(n)$ does not hold, then $\overline{\delta}(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D) < 1$. Moreover, if for $0 \leq a \leq d-1$ and $1 \leq j \leq D-1$, there exists $n \equiv a \pmod{d}$ such that $F_j(n) \neq F_{j+1}(n)$, then $\delta(L/K; C_1, \dots, C_D)$ exists.*

Proof. This is an immediate application of Proposition 2.4, Theorem 1.27 and Proposition 2.1. \square

We now treat an example for which there is linear dependence between the θ_i 's. This example was featured in [8], but since it did not satisfy the required linear independence condition under which the authors worked, they couldn't say anything about it. Take $K = \mathbb{F}_7(t)$ and $L = K(\alpha)$ where α has minimal polynomial $f = X^6 - (t^2 + t)X^3 - 1$ over K . Then as detailed in [8, 4.2], $G = \text{Gal}(L/K) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_3$. We note $C_1 = \{\text{id}\}$, $C_2 = \{(12), (13), (23)\}$ and $C_3 = \{(123), (132)\}$, and it is well-known that we have the following character table for G :

\mathfrak{S}_3	C_1	C_2	C_3
χ_0	1	1	1
χ_1	1	-1	1
χ_2	2	0	-1

One has

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \chi_1) = 1 + 4u + 7u^2 = (1 - \gamma_1 u)(1 - \overline{\gamma_1} u),$$

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \chi_2) = 1 + u + 7u^2 = (1 - \gamma_2 u)(1 - \overline{\gamma_2} u),$$

with (those two values are inverted in [8])

$$\gamma_1 = -2 + i\sqrt{3}$$

and

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{-1 + 3i\sqrt{3}}{2}.$$

Then we have $\theta_1 = \arctan\left(-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$, $\theta_2 = \arctan(-3\sqrt{3})$ and $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = \frac{4\pi}{3}$. Adding $\theta_3 = \pi$ because of the coefficient $a_\pi(C)$, we are in the non-degenerate case (because $\theta_2 = -\arccos\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{28}}\right)$ as one easily verifies, and such a number is known not to be a rational multiple of π [21]). With notations from Section 1.2, we have $m = 1, d = 6, c_2 = \frac{2}{3}, b_{1,2} = -1, c_3 = \frac{1}{2}, b_{1,3} = 0$.

A quick computation using PARI/GP shows that for $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and every $a \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, there exists $n \equiv a \pmod{6}$ such that $F_i(n) \neq F_j(n)$, so for every permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_3$, the density $\delta(L/K; C_{\sigma(1)}, C_{\sigma(2)}, C_{\sigma(3)})$ exists, *i.e.* the race between C_1, C_2 and C_3 is weakly inclusive (Definition 0.2). Also, for every permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_3$, the inequality $F_{\sigma(1)}(n) > F_{\sigma(2)}(n) > F_{\sigma(3)}(n)$ happens for some $n \leq 7$ so we may conclude that $0 < \delta(L/K; C_{\sigma(1)}, C_{\sigma(2)}, C_{\sigma(3)}) < 1$ and in particular the race between C_1, C_2 and C_3 is inclusive (Definition 0.2).

Remark. If one wants to study races between functions counting prime divisors of degree less than n , instead of equal to n as above, one can use the following explicit formula ([8, Theorem 2.1]) :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{q^{n/2}} \left(\frac{\#G}{\#C} \sum_{k=1}^n \pi_C(k) - \pi_K(n) \right) &= r_C \frac{q + \sqrt{q}}{q - 1} + r_C \frac{q - \sqrt{q}}{q - 1} e^{in\pi} - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{2g_K} \frac{\gamma(\chi_0, j)}{\gamma(\chi_0, j) - 1} e^{in\theta(\chi_0, j)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \frac{\chi(C)}{\chi(C)} \sum_{j=1}^{M_\chi} \frac{\gamma(\chi, j)}{\gamma(\chi, j) - 1} e^{in\theta(\chi, j)} + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, and use our method similarly since this has the shape we studied above.

2.3 Moments

To bound the probabilities involved in our results in the case $D = 2$, moment estimates, such as Chebyshev's inequality, can prove very useful. In particular, races where, for each a , $\mathbb{P}(f_1(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > f_2(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) \xrightarrow{q \rightarrow +\infty} 1$ or 0 ("extremely biased races") or each $\mathbb{P}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) > f_2(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) \xrightarrow{q \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2}$ ("moderately biased races") can be obtained from sufficiently good estimates on the corresponding means and variances as in [14]. Here the limits are taken with respect to a parameter q attached to the prime number races considered. To go beyond the first two moments, and for example have an explicitly computable characteristic function at our disposal as in [6, Theorem 3.4] or [8, Theorem 2.4]), we would need to assume extra linear independence.

In the next Proposition, we give formulas for the first two moments of the random variables $f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)$ for some particular types of functions f_j .

Proposition 2.6. *Let $f = c + \sum_{k=1}^r a_k X_k + \overline{a_k} X_k^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ be without poles on \mathbb{T}^r . Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers such that $\theta_i \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $i \leq n$, and $\theta_i \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $n < i \leq r$. Then for $0 \leq a \leq d-1$, one has $\mathbb{E}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = c + \sum_{k=n}^r (\nu_\theta^a a_k + \overline{\nu_\theta^a a_k})$ and $\text{Var}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^2$. In particular $\text{Var}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta))$ does not depend on a , and if $\theta_i \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$, then $\mathbb{E}(f(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = c$ does not depend on a .*

Proof. We note that the n first components of Z_θ are products of non-zero integral powers of independent uniform random variable on \mathbb{T} , so they are uniform on \mathbb{T} , while the last $r-n$ components of Z_θ are (almost-surely) equal to 1. The result then follows from the linearity of the mean, and the fact that the covariance of any two non-inverse uniform random variables on \mathbb{T} is zero. \square

As a corollary of the above Proposition, we deduce another sufficient condition for ties between those functions to have density zero.

Corollary 2.7. *For $1 \leq j \leq D$, let $f_j = c_j + \sum_{k=1}^r a_k^{(j)} X_k + \overline{a_k^{(j)}} X_k^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ be without pole on \mathbb{T}^r . Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ be real numbers such that $\theta_i \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $i \leq n$, and $\theta_i \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ for $n < i \leq r$. Finally, let $G_j : t \mapsto f_j(e^{i\theta_1 t}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r t}) + o(1)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.*

- i) If $n > 1$ (i.e. we are in the non-degenerate case) and if the map $j \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k^{(j)}|^2$ is injective then for every permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, D\}$, $\delta(G_{\sigma(1)} > \dots > G_{\sigma(D)})$ exists.*
- ii) If for every $a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, the map $j \mapsto c_j + \sum_{k=n}^r (\nu_\theta^a a_k^{(j)} + \overline{\nu_\theta^a a_k^{(j)}})$ is injective then for every permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, D\}$, $\delta(G_{\sigma(1)} > \dots > G_{\sigma(D)})$ exists.*

Proof.

- i) The hypothesis implies that $\text{Var}(f_i(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) - f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) \neq 0$ for any $a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ and any distinct $i, j \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ by Proposition 2.6, so that the random variable $f_i(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) - f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)$ is almost-surely non-constant. By Lemma 1.8, this implies $\mathbb{P}(f_i(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = 0$, and the result follows from Theorem 1.27 *ii*).
- ii) The proof is similar, except that this time $\mathbb{E}(f_i(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) - f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) \neq 0$, which implies again that $\mathbb{P}(f_i(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta) = f_j(\nu_\theta^a Z_\theta)) = 0$.

\square

In the example studied at the end of the previous section, we had $|a_1(C_1)|^2 + |a_2(C_1)|^2 = 20$, $|a_1(C_2)|^2 + |a_2(C_2)|^2 = 4$ and $|a_1(C_3)|^2 + |a_2(C_3)|^2 = 8$ so we obtained another proof of the weak inclusiveness of the race between C_1, C_2 and C_3 .

Appendix : a proof of the discrete Kronecker-Weyl theorem

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Recall $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ are real numbers such that $\{\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r\}$ is linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} ,

$$\Gamma = \left\{ \left(e^{i\theta_1 X}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r X} \right) \mid X \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

and we want to show that for every continuous $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^r} f \, d\lambda,$$

where λ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^r .

By the Stone-Weierstrass theorem, it is enough to prove the result when f is a trigonometric polynomial, that is a linear combination of monomials in z_1, \dots, z_r . Indeed, if the result is true for such functions, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find trigonometric polynomial g such that $\|f - g\|_\infty < \varepsilon$, and for every X big enough we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X g \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^r} g \, d\lambda \right| < \varepsilon.$$

For such X , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^r} f \, d\lambda \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X (f - g) \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^r} (f - g) \, d\lambda \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X g \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^r} g \, d\lambda \right| < 3\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

which proves that

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X f \left(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n} \right) \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^r} f \, d\lambda.$$

By linearity, we now only have to prove the theorem for monomials

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}^r & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{C} \\ f : (z_1, \dots, z_r) & \longmapsto & z_1^{n_1} \dots z_r^{n_r}, \end{array}$$

where $n_1, \dots, n_r \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The result is obviously true if $(n_1, \dots, n_r) = (0, \dots, 0)$, *i.e.* if $f = 1$ since both sides are equal to 1. Now assume at least one n_i is non-zero. On the one hand we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^r} f \, d\lambda = \prod_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{T}} z^{n_k} \, d\lambda = 0.$$

On the other hand, since $\{\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r\}$ is linearly independant over \mathbb{Q} , we have that $n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r \notin 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, so that $e^{i(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)} \neq 1$. Now, summing the geometric progression, we

find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X f(e^{i\theta_1 n}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r n}) &= \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n=1}^X e^{in(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)} \\ &= \frac{1}{X} \frac{e^{i(X+1)(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)} - e^{i(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)}}{e^{i(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)} - 1} \\ &\xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{e^{i(X+1)(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)} - e^{i(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)}}{e^{i(n_1\theta_1 + \dots + n_r\theta_r)} - 1}$ is bounded. \square

Remark. The continuous version of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem states that, assuming $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , for every continuous function $f : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\frac{1}{X} \int_0^X f(e^{i\theta_1 y}, \dots, e^{i\theta_r y}) dy \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^r} f d\mu.$$

Its proof is similar as the one given above. The first step reduces to the case of trigonometric polynomials by using the Stone-Weierstrass theorem, and the last calculation is done with integrals instead of discrete sums.

Acknowledgements

The authour would like to thank Lucile Devin, Daniel Fiorilli and Florent Jouve for useful discussions on the subject, and Peter Humphries for providing proofs of both versions of the Kronecker-Weyl theorem, the continuous one in a MathOverflow thread, and the discrete one in his master thesis [15].

References

- [1] A. Akbary, N. Ng, and M. Shahabi. Limiting distributions of the classical error terms of prime number theory. *Q. J. Math.*, 65(3):743–780, 2014.
- [2] A. S. Besicovitch. *Almost periodic functions*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1955.
- [3] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [4] P. Bleher. On the distribution of the number of lattice points inside a family of convex ovals. *Duke Math. J.*, 67(3):461–481, 09 1992.
- [5] D. Bump, J. W. Cogdell, E. de Shalit, D. Gaitsgory, E. Kowalski, and S. S. Kudla. *An introduction to the Langlands program*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2003. Lectures presented at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, March 12–16, 2001, Edited by Joseph Bernstein and Stephen Gelbart.
- [6] B. Cha. Chebyshev’s bias in function fields. *Compos. Math.*, 144(6):1351–1374, 2008.
- [7] B. Cha, D. Fiorilli, and F. Jouve. Prime number races for elliptic curves over function fields. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 49(5):1239–1277, 2016.
- [8] B. Cha and B.-H. Im. Chebyshev’s bias in Galois extensions of global function fields. *J. Number Theory*, 131(10):1875–1886, 2011.

- [9] L. Devin. Chebyshev’s bias for analytic L-functions. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, pages 1–38. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [10] L. Devin. Limiting properties of the distribution of primes in an arbitrarily large number of residue classes. arXiv:1909.03975, 2019.
- [11] L. Devin and X. Meng. Chebyshev’s bias for products of irreducible polynomials. arXiv:1809.09662, 2020.
- [12] L. Devroye. *Nonuniform random variate generation*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.
- [13] R. Durrett. *Probability—theory and examples*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2019. Fifth edition.
- [14] D. Fiorilli and F. Jouve. Distribution of Frobenius elements in families of Galois extensions. arXiv:2001.05428, 2020.
- [15] P. Humphries. The Mertens and Pólya conjectures in function fields. Australian National University, 2012.
- [16] G. Martin and N. Ng. Inclusive prime number races. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 373(5):3561–3607, 2020.
- [17] N. Ng. *Limiting distributions and zeros of Artin L-functions*. PhD thesis, University of British Columbia, 2000.
- [18] H. Queffélec and M. Queffélec. *Diophantine approximation and Dirichlet series*, volume 2 of *Harish-Chandra Research Institute Lecture Notes*. Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 2013.
- [19] M. Rosen. *Number theory in function fields*, volume 210 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [20] M. Rubinstein and P. Sarnak. Chebyshev’s bias. *Experiment. Math.*, 3(3):173–197, 1994.
- [21] J. L. Varona. Rational values of the arccosine function. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.*, 4(2):319–322, 2006.

Alexandre Bailleul, UNIV. BORDEAUX, IMB, UMR 5251, F 33405, TALENCE, FRANCE
Email address: alexandre.bailleul@math.u-bordeaux.fr